

# Studies on Byzantium, Seljuks, and Ottomans

Reprinted Studies

*by Speros Vryoniś, jr.*

Library of Congress Card Number: 81-51168

ISBN: 0-89003-071-5 (paper); 0-89003-072-3 (cloth)

UNDENA PUBLICATIONS  
Malibu 1981

Reprinted by UNDENA PUBLICATIONS, P.O. Box 97, Malibu, CA 90265

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photo-copy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the author or publisher.

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

## PATTERNS OF POPULATION MOVEMENT IN BYZANTINE ASIA MINOR 1071-1261

Spyros Vryonis, Jr. / Athens - California

The general composition and movement of populations in Asia Minor 1071 - 1261 have been the subject of extensive study and so it would be of no purpose to repeat here all that has been said before on this subject<sup>1</sup>. It would perhaps serve a more useful purpose if one were to attempt to isolate varying types or patterns of population movement in this period of great political, ethnographic, and demographic change. Further, in speaking of Byzantine Asia Minor it must be kept in mind that Byzantine political control in Asia Minor varied drastically during the period under consideration: In 1071 Byzantine political authority ran from the Aegean to Lake Van and from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean; when Alexius I Comnenus ascended the throne ten years later Byzantine political authority was practically non-existent in the peninsula. The era of the first three Comnenoi (1081 - 1176) witnessed a Byzantine reconquista which once more brought the coastal regions under Byzantine control and left the plateau in the hands of the Turks; in the period of the Nicaean empire Byzantine control was limited to the northwest corner of Anatolia<sup>2</sup>. Consequently the effort to isolate types of population movement will, for the most part, be restricted to regions under active Byzantine control, though occasional reference will be made to cases in that part of Anatolia under Turkish control.

Throughout the Byzantine era there had taken place movements of population into and out of the peninsula, principally as a result of

1. C. Cahen, *Pre - Ottoman Turkey*, London, 1968; S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1971; O. Turan, *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye*, Istanbul, 1971.

2. I do not discuss the area of Trebizond, for which see the article of A. Bryer, *The Case of Trebizond*, an Exception, to appear in the current issue of the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.

imperial policies which utilized these colonizations as political, military, and demographic measures<sup>3</sup>. Most extensive, however, were the transplantings of non-Greek populations from Armenia and Syria that occurred subsequent to the Byzantine conquests of northern Syria and of the Armenian principalities in the late tenth and eleventh century. By the mid - eleventh century Syrian Christians had been settled in the regions of Zapetra, Germaniceia, Laqabin, Arabissus, Anazarba, Tarsus, Edessa, and Armenians in the districts of Lycandus, Cilicia, Armeniacon, Chaldia, Cappadocia, Coloneia, and Sebasteia<sup>4</sup>. The historical significance of this governmental policy of large scale colonization of Armenians and Syrians within the eastern Anatolian provinces is well known for it helped prepare the way for the even more extensive and important mass movement of Turkish nomads into the area. From the latter eleventh century the wars of Byzantines and Turks, of Christians and Muslims, were most frequently accompanied by movements of population and indeed the demographic element is ultimately the most important part of the history of Anatolia in this period.

In the attempt to describe varying patterns of population movement it is essential to ascertain the nature of contemporary Turkish nomadism and to differentiate it from the nature of the sedentary state, whether Seljuk or Byzantine. Not only were the natures of their societies vastly different, the one being nomadic and the other sedentary, but they effected differing types of population movement and settlement. The nature of movements and settlements of the nomads were peculiar and they were often decisive in changing the demographic nature of Anatolia. Though there is no systematic, contemporary account of the nomadic movement there is a rather widespread coverage of certain aspects of this movement from western Asia Minor to the borders of Georgia, Edessa, and Melitene in the east, and from northern Asia Minor to the Taurus in the south. The sources include Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Latin chroniclers, Byzantine historians, as well as occasional Muslim accounts, and the fact that they all agree in their descriptions of certain aspects of this nomadism indicates that we have basic historical sources at our disposal for the description of nomadic society, movements and settlements.

3. P. Charanis, *The Transfer of Population as a Policy in the Byzantine Empire, Comparative Studies in Society and History*, III (1961), 140 - 154.

4. For the details and bibliography, Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 53 - 55.

It is clear from the sources not only that the majority of Turks who moved into Anatolia at this early stage were nomads<sup>5</sup> but that they were substantially numerous, and that the nomadic movement into Asia Minor constituted an ethnic migration. By and large where the nomads succeeded in entering Byzantine political authority came to an end<sup>6</sup>.

Some few years after the battle of Manzikert, still in the reign of Michael VII, the «Turks had scattered out into all the Rhomaic themes»<sup>7</sup>, and though they bypassed many, if not most of the large fortified towns, the countryside was at their mercy. The military career of Alexius Comnenus, which seems to commence in the reign of Michael VII, gives us a glimpse into the comprehensive nature of the nomadic penetration of Asia Minor in the immediate aftermath of Manzikert. Early in the reign of Michael, Isaac Comnenus (brother of Alexius) was sent to Cappadocia to halt the Turks, but was defeated and captured. Alexius succeeded in escaping with great difficulty, for Cappadocia was, by then, swarming with Turks<sup>8</sup>. After having made his way back to Constantinople to obtain the ransom money for Isaac's release he made his way to Ankara but the inhabitants of the town refused to open the gates to him in the evening for the city was surrounded by Turkmen bands. Once he managed to secure the release of his brother and the two set out on their return through Bithynia they were intercepted by Turks at Decte<sup>9</sup>. By this time Alexius seems to have acquired experience and dexterity in dealing with the Turkmen chieftains, for it was by reaching an accommodation with them that he was able to take captive the Norman mercenary Roussel and to dissolve his newly founded principality in Armeniacon. On departing from Amaseia Alexius decided to visit his ancestral estates at Castamon but found them deserted and the Turks pillaging the area. Having escaped the marauders with some difficulty

5. They were referred to, variously, as *τουρκομάνοι*, *ποιμνῖται*, *πολυθρέμονες*, *σκηνῖται* by the Greek authors; as *Bedewini* or *silvestres Turci* by the Latin observers; as *Turkmens of the Udj* by the Arab and Syriac authors. Vryonis, *Nomadization and Islamization in Asia Minor*, footnotes 19 - 24, to appear in the current issue of the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.

6. There may have been areas of «condominium» or «symbiosis», as emerges in the area of Trebizond, A. Bryer as in footnote 2 above. I am preparing a separate note on the matter of symbiosis on the western borders, which will appear elsewhere.

7. Attaliates - Bonn, 198,

8. Bryennius - Bonn, 62 - 63.

9. Bryennius - Bonn, 66.

he set out for Heracleia on the Black Sea where again he had to fight his way through Turkish raiders <sup>10</sup>. This brief glimpse into his career gives us an idea of the initial movement of nomads into the "Rhomaic themes", and indicates their widespread penetration into the rural areas.

In the face of this ethnic migration the countryside was occupied first, and the towns seem to have undergone a more variegated fate in the beginning. In the 21 years prior to the battle of Manzikert at least eleven major urban centers were sacked : Artze (1049), Paipert (1054), Perkri (1054), Melitene (1057), Sebasteia (1059), Ani (1064), Caesareia (1067), Neocaesareia (1068), Amorium (1068), Iconium (1069), Chonae (1070) <sup>11</sup>. Many towns, however, survived the initial Turkish invasions, and secure behind their walls remained isolated fortresses in an area undergoing nomadic conquest and settlement. The towns entered a third stage in their evolution when Byzantine rebels introduced the nomads into the towns as allies and garrisons. Nicephorus Botaniates, when he revolted against Michael VII in 1077 was able to raise only 200 troops and so when he advanced from the theme of Anatolicon he engaged the services of the Turkmens of Sulayman and posted them as garrisons in the towns of Nicaea, Chalcedon, Pylae, Chrysopolis, Praenetus, Nicomedeia, Ruphinianae, and Cyzicus <sup>12</sup>. The process of the movement of nomads into the towns seems to have been completed a few years later when Nicephorus Melissenus turned over a considerable number of towns to the various Turkmen emirs who were to garrison them on his behalf <sup>13</sup>.

The fate of the countryside and towns seems to indicate the following general pattern of movement on the part of the nomads : Initial and temporary occupation of the rural areas followed by a gradual establishment of the Turks in the countryside; partial destruction of the towns and a large scale isolation of the walled towns; passage of the towns into the hands of the Turkmen emirs. This process is confirmed, and indeed spelled out in considerable detail for the area of northeastern Asia Minor and the Caucasus by the Georgian Chronicle. The text is particularly crucial as it identifies the basic type of nomadic movement and settlement which is evident in other parts of Asia Minor.

10. Bryennius - Bonn, 92 - 95.

11. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 86 - 96.

12. Attaliates - Bonn, 263 - 268.

13. Bryennius - Bonn, 158.

«The emirs spread out, like locusts, over the face of the land... The countries of Asis - Phourni, Clardjeth, up to the shores of the sea, Chawceth, Adchara, Samtzkhe, Karthli, Argoueth, Samokalako and Dchqondid were filled with Turks who pillaged and enslaved all the inhabitants. In a single day they burned Kouthathis, Artanoudj, the hermitages of Clardjeth, and they remained in these lands, until the first snows, devouring the land, massacring all those who had fled to the forests, to the rocks, to the caves» <sup>14</sup>.

«The calamities of Christianity did not come to an end soon thereafter, for at the approach of spring the Turks returned to carry out the same ravages and left (again) in the winter. The (inhabitants) however were unable to plant or to harvest. The land, (thus) delivered to slavery, had only animals of the forests and wild beasts for inhabitants. Karthli was in the grip of intolerable calamities such as one cannot compare to a single devastation or combination of evils of past times. The holy churches served as stables for their horses, the sanctuaries of the Lord served as repairs for their abominations (Islam). Some of the priests were immolated during the holy communion itself, and others were carried off into harsh slavery without regard to their old age. The virgins were defiled, the youths circumcized, and the infants taken away. The conflagration, extending its ravages, consumed all the inhabited sites, the rivers instead of water flowed blood. I shall apply the sad words of Jeremiah, which he applied so well to such situations: 'The honorable children of Zion, never put to the test by misfortunes, now voyaged as slaves on foreign roads. The streets of Zion now wept because there was no one (left) to celebrate the feasts. The tender mothers, in place of preparing with their hands the nourishment of the sons were themselves nourished from the corpses of these dearly beloved. Such and worse was the situation at that time...' <sup>15</sup>.

«As Isaiah said: 'Your land is devastated, your cities reduced to ashes, and foreigners have devoured your provinces, which are sacked and ruined by barbarian nations'» <sup>16</sup>.

By the late eleventh and early twelfth century the movement of the nomadic tribes has been transformed according to the patterns of transhumant nomadism. The nomads, with their tents, families,

14. M. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, St. Petersburg, 1849, I, 347.

15. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, I, 348.

16. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, I, 350.

and flocks, do not depart from Anatolia at the beginning of winter but occupy the lands of the Christian farmers whom they have killed, enslaved, or caused to flee. Their movements are now regional and seasonal, as they move to the highlands with families and flocks in the summer and descend to the river valleys in the winter, all the while raiding at the expense of their Christian neighbors. «We see here described the full cycle of nomadic raid, conquest, and settlement. It begins with the seasonal raids of spring and summer, followed by withdrawal at the onset of the winter snows which made existence for the nomads and their flocks impossible. The raids are renewed annually at the onset of the vernal season until the invaded region is depopulated through flight, death, enslavement, and agriculture comes to a halt. Then the cities, isolated from their agricultural hinterlands, eventually fall also. With the flight of the agricultural population the nomads occupy the land which is now turned over to their flocks and thus the kernel of a complete social entity, a nomadic society, is interposed. The dynamics of the situation thus depend on whether the host society is sufficiently strong militarily either to contain this foreign body and restrict its spread or else to remove it altogether. If there is no strong central authority the nomadic core is free to expand until an equilibrium between land and nourishment on the one hand is sufficient for the number of men, livestock and the acquisitive hunger of the pastoral groups on the other. That which pushed this dynamic forward was the nature of this type of nomadism. The very process by which the agricultural society was eroded, strengthened and enriched the nomads and stimulated them to further expansion. Thus we are witnessing the timeless struggle of farmers and herdsmen, the desert and the sown»<sup>17</sup>.

The description of the process and stages of nomadization that the Georgian Chronicle has preserved for northeastern Anatolia and the Caucasus coincides with and confirms the process in other parts of Asia Minor, a process which resulted in the establishment of varying independent or semi-independent Turkmen emirs who seemed to ignore Seljuk sultans and Byzantine emperors with equal impunity<sup>18</sup>.

Thus the first and most important movement of population into Byzantine Asia Minor during the period under consideration was nomadic. It was important first because it introduced a new religio-ethnic

17. Vryonis, as in footnote 5 above, *passim*.

18. Anna Comnena - Budé, II, 110 - 115, 158 - 161, 64 - 66, 79 - 81; III, 23, 26, 144.

group which would eventually effect a massive ethnic transformation, but it was also of immediate significance because it set off widespread population movements on the part of the Christian inhabitants of the peninsula. The insertion, often violent, of compact nomadic groups into various regions of Byzantine Asia Minor had the concurrent effect of inducing flight - movement on the part of the indigenous, rural population. In western Asia Minor the population very often fled to the security of the Greek isles and Thrace<sup>19</sup> and when Alexius reconquered this area he found that the coastal region from Smyrna to Attaleia had been abandoned by the Greek population<sup>20</sup>. By the later eleventh century the nomadic movement precipitated a veritable migration of the panic-stricken Christians from the districts of Cappadocia and Lycandus toward the security of the Taurus mountains and Cilicia.

«Everywhere throughout Cilicia, up to Taurus, Marash, and Deluh and the environs, reigned agitation and trouble. For populations were precipitated into these regions en masse, coming by the thousands and crowding into them. They were like locusts, covering the surface of the land. They were more numerous, I might add seven times more numerous, than the people whom Moses led across the Red Sea; more numerous than the pebbles in the desert of Sinai. The land was inundated by these multitudes of people. Illustrious personages, nobles, chiefs, women of position, wandered in begging their bread. Our eyes witnessed this sad spectacle»<sup>21</sup>.

Thus there is observable a general movement of rural populations out of the plateau, and indeed out of the peninsula in the case of western Asia Minor. In addition the sources record smaller scale movements of rural populations fleeing the countryside in order to seek refuge in the security of walled towns or «...to hide in the caves, forests, mountains, and hills»<sup>22</sup>. Many of the rural areas fell out of cultivation, and certain towns and villages lay destroyed for long periods of time<sup>23</sup>.

19. Anna Comnena - Budé, III, 142. Attalies - Bonn, 211, 267.

20. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 217.

21. *Chronique de Matthieu d'Édesse* (962 - 1136) avec la continuation de Grégoire le prêtre jusqu'en 1162, tr. E. Dulaurier, Paris, 1858, 182. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 170.

22. Anna Comnena - Budé, III, 229.

23. See the table of destroyed town in Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 166 - 167.



The first mass movement of population is thus the rapid expansion of the nomads into Byzantine Asia Minor accompanied by the disorganized flight and disruption of the sedentary Christian society in many areas. This is a type of population movement which operated spontaneously and without any direction or organized, central planning. The second phase of population movement was much more controlled, programmed, systematic, and arose as a reaction on the part of centralized governmental authority to the initial mass movements of population. The phase began with the military victories of the First Crusaders and the massive program of reconquest effected by Alexius I Comnenus, which succeeded in driving the nomads out of all the coastal regions and driving them precipitously onto the mountainous edges of the Anatolian plateau on the north, south, and west. This had the double effect of transforming the nomadic demographic presence from a scattered one to a compact one in this transitional region between the central plateau and the riverine coastal regions, and of effecting a profound change in the human ecology by intensifying the process of nomadization in the border regions. The Comnenoi and Lascarids were thus primarily concerned with restraining and arresting a type of transhumant and militant nomadism that continually threatened, and eventually undermined, Byzantine society in Asia Minor.

Basic patterns which emerge in the movement of populations in this second period or «controlled» phase involve systematic colonization by emperors and sultans, the efforts of the emperors to fortify settlements with walls, the efforts of the sultans and nomads to prevent this, and the efforts of emperors and sultans to revive rural society. When Alexius I exploited the military successes of the First Crusaders to re-establish Byzantine authority in the coastal regions of Anatolia he was faced with a twofold problem: First he had to rebuild many of the western coastal cities from Adramyttium in the north to Attaleia in the south, as well as Corycus and Seleuceia in Cilicia<sup>24</sup>. Second, he had to assemble colonists with which to repopulate the newly reconquered regions, and he utilized two basic sources of manpower for these colonizing ventures. On the one hand he sought out the former inhabitants of the coastal towns who, in the face of the nomadic conquests, had abandoned Anatolia for the Aegean isles and Thrace. These colonists he supplemented with the large number of Greeks that he removed from

24. Anna Comnena - Budé, III, 45 - 46, 142 - 143.

the Seljuk domains, particularly from the districts of Philomelium, Bourtzes and Iconium <sup>25</sup>. Anna Comnena describes in detail two examples of this latter type of colonization. During his triumphant reconquest of 1098 Alexius marched as far east as the city of Philomelium in Phrygia but inasmuch as the nomadic resistance had hardened he could not advance further. It was at this point that he gathered many of the Greek inhabitants and brought them to western Asia Minor. He repeated the venture in 1116 in the districts between Philomelium and Iconium (Konya) and once more organized a large scale withdrawal of the Greek population, an effort which Anna Comnena describes in considerable detail.

«And the inhabitants of these regions who were Rhomaioi followed them of their own accord fleeing from servitude to the barbarians; these were women with babies, and children, all rushing to the Emperor as if to a place of refuge. He then drew up his lines in the new formation with all the captives, women, and children enclosed in the center, and returned by the same road as he had come, and whatever places he approached, he passed through with perfect safety. And had you seen it, you would have said a living walled city was walking, when the army was marching in the new formation we have described» <sup>26</sup>.

«Anyone hearing the word 'line of battle' and 'phalanx' or 'captives', and 'booty' or again 'general' and 'captains', will think he is hearing about the things which every historian and poet mentions in his writings. But this battle formation was new and seemed very strange to everybody and was such as had never been seen before or handed down to posterity by any historian. For while advancing along the road to Iconium, the army marched in regular order and moved forward in time to the music of a flute. And if you had seen the whole phalanx you would have said it was remaining motionless when in motion and when halting that it was moving. For thanks to the close formation of the shields and the men standing in serried lines it looked like the immoveable mountains, and when it changed its route it moved like a very great beast, for the whole phalanx walked and turned as if directed by one mind. But after it had reached Philomelium and rescued men on all sides from the hand of the barbarians, as we have related before somewhere, and enclosed all the captives and the women too and the

25. Anna Comnena, III, 29, 199 - 204; Zonaras - Bonn, III, 757.

26. Anna Comnena - Budé, III, 203 - 204. Anna Comnena trans. Dawes, 401..

children and the booty in the centre it marched slowly on its return and moved forward leisurely, as it were, and at an ant's pace. Moreover since many of the women were with child and many of the men afflicted with disease, whenever a woman's time for bringing forth came, a trumpet was sounded at a nod from the emperor and made all the men stop and the whole army halted on the instant. And when he knew the child was born, a different call, not the usual one, but provocative of motion, was sounded and stirred them all up to continue the journey. And if anyone died, the same procedure took place, and the Emperor would be at the side of the dying man, and the priests were summoned to sing the hymns for the dying and administer the sacraments to the dying. And after the rites for the dead had been duly performed and not until the dead had been put in the earth and buried, was the army allowed to move even a step. And when it was the Emperor's time for lunch he invited the men and women who were labouring under illness or old age and placed the greater part of the victuals before them and invited those who lunched with him to do the same. And the meal was like a complete banquet of the gods for there were no instruments, not even flutes or drums or any disturbing music at all»<sup>27</sup>.

Some thirty years later (1146) the emperor Manuel returned to this same region, burned the town of Philomelium, removed what Greek population remained there, and then brought it to western Asia Minor<sup>28</sup>. Prior to and immediately after the battle of Myriocephalum (1176) nomads and sultan applied a scorched earth policy and devastated this general area so that the advancing armies of Manuel might not find supplies and pasturage for the army<sup>29</sup>. These events in the region of Philomelium illustrate how a particular type of population change and movement was implemented by governmental policy and supplemented by nomadic settlement. The inability of the emperors to re-establish political authority in these parts of Phrygia caused them to remove a substantial portion of the Greek population so that they would be free of Turkish rule but also so that they might help in recolonizing regions in western Asia Minor. The Turkish scorched earth policy, prior to Myriocephalum, would have also had the effect of decreasing the number of the sedentary population, that is to say of the Greeks in

27. Anna Comnena - Budé, III, 213 - 214. Anna Comnena trans. Dawes, 408.

28. Cinnamus - Bonn, 38 - 46. Nicetas Choniates - Bonn, 231 - 232.

29. Nicetas Choniates - Bonn, 231 - 232.

the countryside. In fact these events are part of a much larger ethnographic and ecological change that took place from Dorylaeum in the north to the outskirts of Attaleia in the south. With the Byzantine repulse of the nomads from the coastal regions to the edge of the plateau between Dorylaeum and the regions of Attaleia there seems to have been a corresponding flight and withdrawal of Greek rural population. The raids and devastations of the area worked to the advantage of pastoral nomadism and to the disadvantage of rural agricultural society. The towns and rural villages gave way to substantial nomadic encampments which drew their economic sustenance from the grazing of flocks on formerly agricultural lands and from the booty taken in raids on adjacent farming populations. When the emperors could not protect the farming population, as in the district of Philomelium, they removed it. The sultans gave support to the nomads as the nomadic zone Dorylaeum - Attaleia served as a defense cordon through which it was almost impossible for Byzantine and Crusading armies to pass.

The impact of this type of militant nomadism was long term and its dynamism eventually succeeded in conquering all of western Asia Minor by the early fourteenth century, as the strength of Nicaea ebbed with the transfer of the capital to Constantinople in 1261. The desertion of the rural areas was most pronounced in those instances when the central towns and administrative centers collapsed, as at Dorylaeum. Completely destroyed during the initial phase of the nomadic invasions in the eleventh century, it lay in ruins until 1175 when Manuel decided to rebuild and recolonize it so as to create a secure base of operations against the nomads of this area. The brief description which Cinnamus gives of the prevailing situation affords us a precious vignette into the struggle of desert and sown.

«There was a time when this Dorylaeum was one of the great cities of Asia and very noteworthy. A gentle breeze blows upon the land, and it has about it very extensive level plains of extraordinary beauty (which are) so rich and fertile that they give forth rich grass and supply rich ears of grain. A river sends its stream through it and it is beautiful to see and sweet to taste. There is such a quantity of fish swimming in it, that no matter how much those fishing take, fish are never lacking. Here, formerly, splendid mansions were built by the Caesar Melissenus, the villages were populous, and (there were) natural springs, stoas and baths, and all such things as bring pleasure to men. These things did the land provide in abundance. But the Persians (Turks), when the

invasion of the land of the Rhomaioi was at its height, had razed the city to the ground and made it completely destitute of people, and they obliterated everything in it, even the thin trace of its former dignity. It was such a city. Then about 2,000 Persian (Turkish) nomads were encamped about it in tents as is their custom»<sup>30</sup>.

The nomadic character of the Turkish settlement is emphasized by the remarks of Nicetas Choniates.

«The Turks were upset (at the prospect of) retreating from the plains of Dorylaeum, in which their herds of cattle and goats passed the summer romping in the grassy meadows»<sup>31</sup>.

The same situation prevailed elsewhere, even within Byzantine territory. Neither the transhumance of the nomads, which required movement for pasturage of their flocks, nor their raids, paid attention to the formal boundaries of the empire. Thus the former site of Choma-Soublaeum in Phrygia, though within the boundaries of the empire, became a nomadic repair and was described by Byzantines as «in the midst of the Persian (Turkish) land»<sup>32</sup>. But even when the Byzantines retained control of the central towns the rural environs were often devastated by the nomads and the farming population abandoned its villages for the security of the walled towns. Thus at Attaleia William of Tyre describes the following interesting circumstances.

«It possesses very rich fields, which are, nevertheless, of no advantage to the townpeople, for they are surrounded by enemies on all sides who hinder their cultivation. Therefore, the fertile soil lies fallow, since there is no one to work it... the grain is brought from overseas»<sup>33</sup>.

The flight of rural populations to the safety of walled towns, and therefore a partial abandoning of the land by the farmers, appear in both eastern and western Anatolia. Phrygian Laodiceia, prior to the Turkish invasions, was a city scattered about the lower slopes of its mountains and was without walls. The invasions caused the scattered inhabitants to effect a central synoicismus and to erect a defensive wall around the newly centralized city<sup>34</sup>. The Byzantine emporium of Artze,

30. Cinnamus - Bonn, 294 - 295.

31. Nicetas Choniates - Bonn, 228.

32. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 189.

33. William of Tyre, XVI, xxvi, tr. Babcock and Krey.

34. Nicetas Choniates - Bonn, 163.

in the east, was like Laodiceia an unwalled settlement scattered over a large area. After its destruction by the Turks the inhabitants fled to the protection of the walled city of Erzerum<sup>35</sup>. The violent disruption of segments of rural village society is dramatically described by Matthew of Edessa.

«Toward the beginning of the year 528 (1079 - 80) famine desolated...the lands of the worshippers of the Cross, already ravaged by the ferocious and sanguinary Turkish hordes. Not one province remained protected from their devastations. Everywhere the Christians had been delivered to the sword or into bondage, interrupting thus the cultivation of the fields, so that bread was lacking. The farmers and workers had been massacred or led off into slavery, and famine extended its rigours to all places. Many provinces were depopulated; the Oriental nation (Armenians) no longer existed and the land of the Greeks was in ruins. Nowhere was one able to procure bread»<sup>36</sup>.

The extent of the flight, or movement, of rural population to the security of walled towns, and therefore the disruption of agricultural life in some areas becomes clear when one considers the case of northwest coastal Asia Minor, a region well within the Byzantine boundaries. The cities of Chliara, Pergamum, and Adramyttium seem to have suffered economically because their agricultural hinterland remained uncultivated from the time of the nomadic invasions of the eleventh century until the reign of Manuel Comnenus. As the villages were unprotected by walls, they were constantly raided by the nomads so that by Manuel's reign the farmers had completely abandoned the land, probably for the walled towns. When Manuel built a series of rural forts and walls, the villages were repopulated, the area was cultivated and the cities prospered. In this case aspects of the city, i.e. walls and fortifications were extended to the countryside<sup>37</sup>.

Essential manifestations in this second «controlled» phase of population movement were not only the rebuilding of towns, such as Dorylaeum, Choma - Soublaeum<sup>38</sup> but also the systematic movement or

35. Attaliates - Bonn, 148. Cedrenus - Bonn, II, 577. Zonaras - Bonn, III, 638 - 639.

36. For this passage and other references to disruption of Christian agrarian settlements, see Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 172 - 173.

37. Theodore Scutariotes - Sathas, 268.

38. The process of rebuilding towns was a constant one in the twelfth and thirteenth century. Alexius I built or rebuilt Cibotus, Sidera, Adramyttium and

transplanting of populations. Reference has already been made to two major sources of colonists exploited by the emperors : Greeks from the domains of the sultans, and Greeks from the isles and the European sections of the empire. But the emperors had recourse to foreigners as well. They settled Serbs, as farmers and soldiers around Nicomedeia in the twelfth century, Latins in Pegae, Armenians in the Troad, Jews

Attaleia and many other towns between these latter two, Corycus, and Seleuceia. John II rebuilt Laodiceia, Lopadium, Achyraous. Manuel I rebuilt Malagina, Pithecias, Pylae, Arcla - Damalis, Dorylaeum, Choma - Soublaeum, and the regions of Pergamum - Chliara - Adramyttium. Isaac II Angelus built Angelocastrum. The work of the Lascarid dynasty, though restricted over a smaller geographical area seems to have been intense in this domain. Theodore Scutariotes - Sathas, 506 - 507, gives a description of the activities of John Vatatzes.

«Who shall enumerate all those things which he has provided in each city throughout the East and the western land, not only in those which are very great and famous but in those as well which by virtue of their smallness and obscurity are fittingly called fortresses and not cities. He acted in behalf of their care and safety, fortifying them with constructions; he built tower after tower, parapet after parapet, and erected wall after wall. In addition he stored away all sorts of weapons; bows, arrows, shields armours, engines for hurling stones and as many other machines as there are for defence against attacking enemies. And in the big cities there were also salaried men, skilled in the (making) of the various weapons, who manufacture so many bows, arrows, and other weapons each year. These were stored in public buildings in great number in order that when there should be need of them the defenders would have them in plenty. And he set aside lands from which the produce should be collected and stored in granaries, or store houses, by the thousands and tens of thousands of medimnoi not only of barley and wheat, but also of the other grains and necessities, saving them for a time of barrenness and need... And there were to be seen entire buildings filled in this manner, with grain, wine, oil, and with the other necessities from the earth, and in addition the towers of the cities were heavy with wheat, barley, and millet. In Lydian Magnesia, where most of the merchandizes were stored, what might not one have sought of those things which men desire and having found it enjoyed it? Not only of those things which are to be found in our lands, but also of as many things (as are to be found) anywhere in the oicumene. in Egypt, I say, and India and elsewhere? And he brought together in the cities libraries of books of all the arts and sciences».

Rebuilding is mentioned specifically at Pergamum, Tralles, and Smyrna, Vryonis. *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 217 - 220. The archaeological surveys of Müller - Wiener confirm the testimony of the written texts and testify to the continuing process of fortifying and building in the Comnenian and Lascarid eras in the districts between Ephesus and Miletus, in Priene and the regions of Mt. Mycale, and in the coastal area of Ephesus and Anaia. Müller - Wiener, *Mittelalterliche Befestigungen im südlichen Ionien*, *Istanbul Mitteilungen*, 11 (1961), 29 - 77, 99 ff. Die Befestigungen von Izmir, Sigacik und Çandarlı, *Istanbul Mitteilungen*, 12 (1962), 59 - 114.

in Cilicia, and in the thirteenth century they settled Cretans, Latins, and Cumans as soldiers<sup>39</sup>. This rebuilding and recolonization extended to the ecclesiastical and monastic domains as well.

On the eastern side of the Byzantino - Turkish borders the Turkish rulers were no less active in the rebuilding of towns and systematic movement and transplanting of populations. Danishmendid and Seljuk princes were continuously active in this respect throughout the twelfth century and the Seljuks continued into the thirteenth century. Cities which were rebuilt included Caesarea, Neocaesarea, Ankara, Aksaray, Dadybra, Konya, and others. Just as the emperors had to seek out colonists for the repopulation of western Asia Minor, so the Turkish rulers sought out demographic sources for the re-peopling of central and eastern Anatolia, as the nomadic invasions and conquests had caused a flight of population and indeed serious depopulation. The newly established Turks were not yet demographically sufficient to fill the demographic void which they had caused, and as many of the Turks were still nomadic they could not satisfy the fiscal needs of the new Turkish states for a productive agricultural population as a stable tax base. These facts explain one of the basic demographic policies of Seljuks and Danishmendids throughout the twelfth century: The mutual raiding of one another's territories and the kidnapping of the Christian farming populations. Numerous kidnappings of the Christian farming populations are recorded, the numbers of captives ranging from 12,000 to 70,000 for central and eastern Anatolia<sup>40</sup>. But what is of immediate concern to us here is not what happened in central and eastern Anatolia, but the events affecting population movement in the regions where the Byzantine and Turkish states shared common borders. Three specific cases, i.e. Seljuk colonization of Dadybra, Attaleia, and Philomelium, will demonstrate clearly the similarity of Turkish policies here to their policies elsewhere in Asia Minor. In 1196, after a four month siege, the northern Byzantine city of Dadybra surrendered to the Turks. Probably because it was a border city in a contested area, the Christian inhabitants were expelled from the city en masse and were replaced with a reliable

39. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 207, 217 - 218. N. Svoronos, *Les privilèges de l'Église à l'époque des Comnènes: un rescrit inédit de Manuel I<sup>er</sup> Comnène*, *Travaux et Mémoires*, 1 (Paris, 1965), 325 - 392.

40. For the details and sources Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 183 - 184.



Muslim population<sup>41</sup>. When Ibn Battuta visited the former Byzantine city of Antalya over a century after its conquest he found five principal quarters in the town: the quarters of the Jews, of foreign Christian merchants, of Greeks, of Muslims, and of the emir and his retinue<sup>42</sup>. This illustrates a second type of settlement - mixed Christian, Muslim, Jewish. The third case deals with the kidnapping of Christian farming populations from Byzantine domains and their resettlement in Seljuk territory. In 1197 the sultan Kaykhusraw enslaved and carried away the entire Greek population, numbering some 5,000, of Caria and Tantalus in the central Maeandrian regions. Carefully guarded so that none would escape during the journey to his domains, he had them and their possessions carefully recorded on the state cadasters and then settled them on lands around Philomelium. Here they were given land and seed to plant, as well as a five year tax immunity, after which they were to pay the same, old Byzantine taxes to the sultan. Their improved lot, for conditions in Byzantine Asia Minor by this time were degenerating as a result of political decline and nomadic raids, had the effect of attracting other Byzantine farmers to settle in the Seljuk domains. The fact that the colonization took place around the area of Philomelium is to be explained by its depopulated state, a state occasioned by the successive removal of Greek populations by Alexius I and Manuel I, as well as by the fact that the region had been burned by Manuel and Frederick Barbarossa, and finally by the fact that it had been scorched by nomads and sultan<sup>43</sup>. This policy of recolonization in the western regions of the Seljuk state was accompanied by the resumption of commercial relations as Greek and Muslim merchants began to travel between Konya and Constantinople<sup>44</sup> in the latter half of the twelfth century, and evidence appears of commercial relations between Turks and Greeks of Lake Pousgousae - Konya and Chonae - Konya<sup>45</sup>. This movement of merchants was greatly facilitated by the creation of an expanded network of caravansarays in the Seljuk domains, which stretched out from Konya and Caesarea to the east, north, south, and west. Among

41. Nicetas Choniates - Bonn, 624 - 626.

42. Ibn Battuta - Gibb, 2, 418, 460.

43. Nicetas Choniates - Bonn, 655 - 657. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 184.

44. Nicetas Choniates - Bonn, 653 - 654. Vryonis, Byzantine *Δημοκρατία* and the Guilds in the Eleventh Century, *DOP*, 17 (1963), 291.

45. Michael Acominatus, ed. S. Lampros, I, 56; Nicetas Choniates - Bonn, 50.

the earliest of these caravansarays which the sultans built were those connecting the Seljuk domains with western Byzantine Asia Minor : Argit Khan (prior to 1201 - 1202) on the road from Konya to Akshehir; Altun Aba Khan (c. 1200) west of Konya; Kurucheshme Khan (between 1207 - 10) on the road from Begshehir to Konya; Deve Khan at Seyid Ghazi (c. 1207 - 08); Egret Khan (early 13th century). These caravansarays were built to accommodate the growing movement of merchants and others travellers through the Byzantine - Turkish border regions and they not only reflect the growing movement of this specialized population, but also they reflect the thorough and integrative character of Seljuk colonization policies<sup>46</sup>.

46. For this network consult K. Erdmann, *Das anatolische Karavansaray des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, 1961, the map in volume I. Also Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 221 - 223.